IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

THURSDAY, THE 22ND MARCH 2007 / 1ST CHAITHRA 1929

RP.No. 304 OF 2007()

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WA.2024/2004
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/RESPONDENT IN W.A.

STATE OF KERALA REP.BY THE SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
TRIVANDRUM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. NOBLE MATHEW.

RESPONDENTS: APPELLANT AND ADDL. RESPONDENTS IN W.A.
---

1. K.MOHAMMED ABDUL RAHIMAN, MANAGER,
VIVEKODAYAM A.L.P. SCHOOL, KARAKUTHANGADI,
(P.O.) MUTHUTHALA, PATTAMBI.

2. K. ALIKUTTY, KORAKKOTTIL HOUSE,
KARAKUTHANGADI, MUTHUTHALA P.O., PALAKKAD DT.

3. C.K.MOIDU, CHERUMKUZHIYIL,
KARAKKUTH ANGADI, POST MUTHUTHALA,
PATTAMBI, PIN- 679 314.

BY ADV. SRI.P.CHANDRASEKHAR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMIISSION ON 22/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P.R. RAMAN & ANTONY DOMINIC, JJ.

R.P.NO. 304/2007 IN W.A. 2024/2004

DATED THIS, THE 22ND DAY OF MARCH, 2007.

O R D E R

Raman, J.

This is an application seeking review of the judgment in W.A. 2024/2004. As per judgment dated 30th June, 2006, W.A. 2024/2004 was disposed of in the following lines:

> Learned counsel for the parties agree that this matter has to be disposed of in terms of the judgment in a similar Writ Appeal bearing No. 545 of 2004 decided on 1st March, 2006, setting aside the order passed by the learned Single judge. We thus issue the same directions in this case as were issued in W.A. No. 545 of 2004.
>
> Writ Appeal is disposed of accordingly."

Thereafter, a review petition was filed as R.P. 15/2007 which was disposed of by order dated 22.1.2007. The relevant portion of the said order is extracted below:

> "The learned Advocate General states that the Government is to seek review of the orders earlier passed. We may only mention that the writ appeal was disposed of in terms of the judgment in a similar writ appeal bearing No. 545 of 2004. The same directions were issued in this case as were

> issued in W.A. No. 545 of 2004. If the Government may successfully seek review of the said order, then only the present review application would be competent. Dismissed with liberty to move a fresh application if the Government successfully gets reviewed the order in W.A. No. 545/2004."

Subsequently, the appellant filed a review application seeking to review the basic judgment in W.A. 545/2004 by filing R.P. 277/2007 which was dismissed as per order dated 15.3.2007. If so, in the light of the order passed in R.P. 15/2007 as noticed above, there is no scope for filing any other review petition in this matter.

Accordingly, after hearing both sides, the review petition is dismissed.

Issue emergent copy.

P.R. RAMAN,
(JUDGE)

ANTONY DOMINIC,
(JUDGE)

knc/-